

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 7, 2005. Claims 1 - 14 are now presented for examination. Claims 1, 6 and 10 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. Support for these amendments is detailed in the remarks that follow. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 6 and 10 are independent.

Favorable review is respectfully requested.

The §102 rejection:

Claims 1 – 6 and 8 – 14 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Aziz et al. (U.S. 2002/0135296 A1).

Independent claims 1, 6 and 10 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter applicants regard as their invention. Specifically, claims 1, 6 and 10 have been amended to more particularly claim that the buffer layer is selected to have a density lower than the

density of the luminous layer and lower than the density of the cathode. Support for this amendment is found at least in paragraphs 0059 and 0060.

The buffer layer is selected to be sufficiently soft and have a density less than the luminous layer and cathode so as to be able to sufficiently buffer the stress applied from the protective film. Aziz does not teach or suggest a buffer layer selected to have a density less than the luminous layer and cathode. Accordingly, Aziz does not anticipate Applicants' amended claims 1, 6 and 10. Since claims 2 – 5, 8, 9, and 11 – 14 depend directly from claims 1, 6 and 10 respectively, and since claims 1, 6 and 10, as amended, are believed to be allowable, then claims 2 – 5, 8, 9, and 11 – 14 are believed to be allowable as well.

The §103 rejection:

Claim 7 has been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Aziz et al. (U.S. 2002/0135296 A1) in view of Hosokawa et al. (U.S. 6,157,127).

As discussed above, claim 6 has been amended to more particularly claim that the buffer layer is selected to have a density lower than the density of the luminous layer and lower than the density of the cathode. Neither Hosokawa, nor

Aziz teach or suggest a buffer layer selected to have a density less than the luminous layer and cathode. Accordingly, neither Hosokawa, nor Aziz, nor a combination thereof renders obvious Applicants' amended claim 6. Since claim 7 depends from claim 6, and since claim 6, as amended, is believed to be allowable, then claim 7 is believed to be allowable as well.


Summary:

In view of all the preceding amendments and remarks, it is respectfully requested that any objections or rejections to this application be reconsidered and withdrawn. Further action with respect to the present application is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner finds this application is deficient in any respect, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the Examiner's earliest possible convenience.

For the foregoing reasons, allowance of the claims is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Kohji Murayama, et al.

By:


James J. Cioffi, Attorney
Registration No. 51,564
Telephone: (845) 894-3363

JJC/hh

S/N 10/689,202

8

JP920010391US1